



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,344

12/12/2003

Robert Williamson

38898-0055

7457

7590

11/01/2006

Mr. William B. Vass
c/o Ridout & Maybee LLP
Suite 2400
One Queen Street East
Toronto, ON M5C 3B1
CANADA

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,344

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMSON, ROBERT

Examiner

Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal

In view of the appeal brief filed on Jul. 14, 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. Applicant's arguments are persuasive and the final rejection is withdrawn. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing at the end.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 21, 30, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simon et al [US 6,442,370 B1].

Regarding claim 21, Simon et al teach an apparatus for dialing a communication terminal shown in Fig. 2, comprising:

a memory (not shown) for storing a plurality of directory entries (i.e. list) corresponding to a plurality of communication terminals [col. 1, lines 30-34; col. 2, lines 22-27];

an input for entering a string of alphanumeric digits corresponding to one of the plurality of communication terminals [Fig. 3, step 302; Fig. 1, block 106];

a comparator (216) for comparing the string, as each digit is entered, to the plurality of directory entries [FIG. 2; Fig. 3, step 304; col. 2, lines 28-34];

a display (210) for displaying one or more matching directory entries as each digit is entered [Fig. 3, step 308; Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 14-21];

a selector component for selecting one of the matching directory entries [Fig. 3, step 310; col. 2, lines 51-53; Fig. 1, block 110]; and

a dialer component for dialing the communication terminal to the selected entries [Fig. 3; block 312; Figs. 1-2; col. 1, line 58 to col. 2, line 53].

Claims 30 and 37 are essentially similar to claim 21 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 22-29, 31-36, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al as applied to claims 21, 30, 37 above, and further in view of Havel [US 6,791,667].

Regarding claim 22, Simon et al do not teach expressly using a counter to count the digits entered.

Havel teaches an apparatus shown in Fig. 2, comprising a counter (6) to count the digits entered, and a comparator (5) being responsive to the counter when a pre-determined number of digits is entered [col. 2, lines 36-39].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the counter and the counter threshold of Havel to Simon's comparator in order to determine a type of a telephone call [Havel; col. 1, lines 13-17].

Claims 31 and 38 are essentially similar to claim 22 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 23, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the directory entries comprise the number and a name, the name being mapped to digits on the key pad [Fig. 1].

Claims 34 and 39 are essentially similar to claim 23 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 24, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the comparator (216) includes a component for comparing the received digits to the number for each of the directory entries and a component for comparing the received digits to the digits mapped to the name for each of the directory entries (i.e. list 214) [Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 23-44].

Claims 35 and 40 are essentially similar to claim 24 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 25, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the additional entry comprises another digit entered by the user using the key pad (208) [Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 27-34].

Regarding claim 26, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the additional entry comprises a navigational key entry (not shown) for scrolling [Figs. 1, 3; col. 2, lines 4-6; col. 2, lines 49-51].

Claim 32 is essentially similar to claim 26 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 33, Simon et al further teach the method, wherein the additional input comprises one or more digits entered by the user, and the additional digits result in a single entry matching the digits entered by the user [Fig. 1; block 110].

Regarding claim 27, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the component for selecting comprises a navigational key for scrolling [Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 49-53].

Regarding claim 28, Simon et al further teach the apparatus, wherein the communication terminal includes one or more line keys, and the component for dialing is responsive to one of the line keys being selected by the user for selecting one of displayed numbers [Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 48-53].

Regarding claim 29, Simon et al further teach the apparatus (i.e. telephone 202) ,

wherein the communication terminal includes a handset (not shown) , and the component for dialing is responsive to the handset being lifted by the user [Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 14-22].

Claim 36 is essentially similar to claim 29 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(i) Padawer et al [US 7,072,461 B2] teach merging various request methods into a single unified user interface [Whole document];

(ii) Yang [US 6,766,017 B1] teaches a method for retrieving a telephone number stored in a mobile telephone [Figs. 1-4; Abstract]; and

(iii) Asokan et al [US 20040018857 A1] teach a predictive input dialing [Whole document].

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2614



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600